arXiv:1601.05160v3 [math.NT] 30 Jan 2016

ON THE RATIONAL APPROXIMATIONS TO THE REAL NUMBERS CORRESPONDING TO THE DIFFERENCES OF THE FIBONACCI SEQUENCE

YING-JUN GUO, ZHI-XIONG WEN AND JIE-MENG ZHANG

Abstract. Based on the structure of Fibonacci sequence, we give a new proof for the irrationality exponents of the Fibonacci real numbers. Moreover, we obtain all the irrationality exponents of the real numbers corresponding to the differences of Fibonacci sequence.

1. Introduction

In 2007, Adamczewski and Allouche [1] proved that the irrationality exponent of the Fibonacci real numbers equals $1+\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$. For this, they studied the real numbers

$$S_b(\alpha)=(b-1)\sum_{n\geq 1}\frac{1}{b^{\lfloor n\alpha\rfloor}}$$

for any irrational α and any integer b, both larger than 1. By the continued fraction expansion [1] of $S_b(\alpha)$, they proved that the irrationality exponent of the number $S_b(\alpha)$ equals $1+\limsup_{n\to\infty}[a_n,a_{n-1},\cdots,a_0]$ for any irrational number $\alpha=[a_0,a_1,a_2,\cdots]>1$ and any integer $b\geq 2$. Recall that the *irrationality exponent* (sometimes called the *irrationality measure*) of an irrational real number ξ, denoted by $\mu(\xi)$, is defined as the supremum of the set of real numbers μ such that the inequality

$$\left|\xi-\frac{p}{q}\right|<\frac{1}{q^{\mu}}$$

holds for infinitely many $\frac{p}{q}\in\mathbb{Q}$. Clearly, $\mu(\xi)\geq 2$ for any irrational number ξ and for almost all real numbers, including all the algebraic irrational numbers, $\mu(\xi)=2$.

In [2], Adamczewski and Bugeaud proved that every irrational automatic or binary morphic real number (whose b-expansion is an automatic or morphic sequence for some integer $b\geq 2$) is transcendental. Then many automatic transcendental numbers have been studied in [3, 4, 8, 11, 12, 15]. Moreover, Bugeaud, Krieger and Shallit conjectured in [9] that the irrationality exponent of every automatic(resp.,morphic) number is rational (resp.,algebraic). In this paper, we are interested in the irrationality exponents of the binary morphic real numbers $\xi_{\varepsilon,b}$ for any integer $b\geq 2$, where

$$\xi_{\varepsilon,b}:=\sum_{i\geq 0}\frac{\varepsilon_i}{b^i}=\varepsilon_0+\frac{\varepsilon_1}{b}+\frac{\varepsilon_2}{b^2}+\cdots,$$

[1] It was originally discovered by Böhmer [7]. It was independently rediscovered by Danilov [13], Davison [14], Adams and Davison [5], Bullett and Sentenac [10], and Shiu [17].

and $\varepsilon = \varepsilon^k := \varepsilon_0\varepsilon_1\varepsilon_2\cdots$ is the fixed point of the morphism

$$\sigma(0) = 0^k 1, \sigma(1) = 0, (k \geq 1). \tag{1.1}$$

Note that the morphism σ defined by (1.1) is an invertible substitution [20, 21, 22]. Its fixed point ε is a Sturmian sequence and studied by many authors [6, 18, 19, 21]. In this paper, we will study the structure of ε. Based on the structure, we shall prove following theorem.

Theorem 1. *For any integers $b \geq 2, k \geq 1$, we have $\mu(\xi_{\varepsilon^k,b}) = 1 + \frac{k+\sqrt{k^2+4}}{2}$.*

In particular, when $k = 1$, the sequence ε^1 is the famous Fibonacci sequence. For any integer $b \geq 2$, the real number $\xi_{\varepsilon^1,b}$ is called to be the *Fibonacci real number*. Hence, we have following corollary.

Corollary 1. *For any integer $b \geq 2$, we have $\mu(\xi_{\varepsilon^1,b}) = 1 + \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$.*

In fact, Corollary 1 gives a new proof for Adamczewski and Allouche's result. To see this, take $\alpha = \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2} = [1, 1, \cdots]$, define two binary sequences

$$g_\alpha(n) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } n = \lfloor k\alpha \rfloor \text{ for some integer } k; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

and $f_{\frac{1}{\alpha}}(n) = \lfloor (n+1)\frac{1}{\alpha} \rfloor - \lfloor n\frac{1}{\alpha} \rfloor$. Then, by Lemma 9.1.3 and Corollary 9.1.6 in [6], the sequence $f_{\frac{1}{\alpha}}(n) = 1 - \varepsilon_n$ and

$$\sum_{n\geq 1} \frac{1}{b^{\lfloor n\alpha \rfloor}} = \sum_{n\geq 1} \frac{g_\alpha(n)}{b^n} = \sum_{n\geq 1} \frac{f_{1/\alpha}(n)}{b^n} = \sum_{n\geq 1} \frac{1-\varepsilon_n}{b^n}.$$

Hence, $S_b(\alpha) = (b-1)(\frac{1}{b-1} - \xi_{\varepsilon^1,b}) = 1 - (b-1)\xi_{\varepsilon^1,b}$. Hence, Corollary 1 implies the following theorem.

Theorem 2 (Adamczewski and Allouche [1])**.** *If $\alpha = \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2} = [1, 1, \cdots]$, then for any integer $b \geq 2$, $\mu(S_b(\alpha)) = 1 + \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$.*

Not only we obtain the irrationality exponents corresponding to the sequence ε, but also we give a new property of the irrationality exponent corresponding to the Sturmian sequence. We prove that the irrationality exponent is invariant under direct product with a shift of the original Sturmian sequence.

Proposition 1. *For any Sturmian sequence $\mathbf{u} \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$, assume the sequence $\mathbf{u} \times S(\mathbf{u}) := \{[u_i, u_{i+1}]\}_{i\geq 0}$ is a non-eventually periodic integer sequence. If their exists an integer $a \geq 2$ such that $\mu(\xi_{\mathbf{u},b}) = a$ for any $b \geq 2$, then $\mu(\xi_{\mathbf{u}\times S(\mathbf{u}),b}) = a$ for any integer $b \geq 2$.*

Recently, Guo and Wen proved in [16] that all the irrationality exponents of the differences are equal to 2. Recall that the difference of an binary sequence $\mathbf{u} = u_0u_1u_2\cdots$, denoted by $\Delta(\mathbf{u})$, is the sequence $\{(u_{n+1} - u_n)(\mathrm{mod}2)\}_{n\geq 0}$. For any $k \geq 1$, $\Delta^k = \Delta(\Delta^{k-1}(\mathbf{u}))$ and $\Delta^0(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{u}$. Using Proposition 1, we will obtain all the irrationality exponents of the real numbers corresponding to the differences of Sturmian sequences.

Corollary 2. *For any Sturmian sequence $\mathbf{u} \in \{0,1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$, if their exists an integer $a \geq 2$ such that $\mu(\xi_{\mathbf{u},b}) = a$ for any $b \geq 2$, then for any integer $k \geq 1$, $\mu(\xi_{\Delta^k(\mathbf{u}),b}) = a$ for any integer $b \geq 2$.*

In particular, we have

Corollary 3. *For any integer $b \geq 2$, $\mu(\xi_{\Delta^k(\varepsilon^1),b}) = 1 + \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$.*

Corollary 2 and Corollary 3 tell us that we can get the irrationality exponents of a large class of morphis numbers. Moreover, most of them are the numbers whose b-expansions are not Sturmian sequences.

Example 1. *It easy to check that $\Delta^2(\varepsilon^1) = 01100011011\cdots$. The sequence $\Delta^2(\varepsilon^1)$ is not a sturmian sequence, since both the $'00'$ block and $'11'$ block appear in the sequence. By Corollary 3, we have $\mu(\xi_{\Delta^2(\varepsilon^1),b}) = 1 + \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$.*

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we study the structure of the sequence ε. In Section 3, we prove Theorem 1 and Proposition 1.

2. Structure of the sequence ε

In this section, we will study the sequence ε. Set $U_n = \sigma^n(0)$, where σ^n denote the n-th iteration of σ by $\sigma^n = \sigma(\sigma^{n-1}), n \geq 1$. U_n^* is denoted the word obtained by interchange the last two letters of U_n. Define $f_n := |U_n|$ $(n \geq 0)$, where $|W|$ denotes the length of the finite word W. Then $(f_n)_{n\geq -2}$ can be defined by a recursive formula as follow:

$$f_{n+2} = kf_{n+1} + f_n, (n \geq -2), f_{-2} = 1 - k, f_{-1} = 1. \tag{2.1}$$

Lemma 1. *For any integer $n \geq 2$, we have following statements:*
(1) $U_{n-1}U_n = U_nU_{n-1}^*$,
(2) $U_{n+2} = U_n(U_n^kU_{n-1}^*)^k$.

Proof. (1) By induction on n, the case $n = 2$ is trivial. Assume that the result is true for all $n \leq m$; we need to prove it for $n = m + 1$.

Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} U_mU_{m+1} &= U_mU_m^kU_{m-1} = U_m^kU_mU_{m-1} \\ &= U_m^kU_{m-1}^kU_{m-2}U_{m-1} = U_m^kU_{m-1}U_{m-1}^{k-1}U_{m-2}U_{m-1} \\ &= U_{m+1}U_{m-1}^{k-1}U_{m-1}U_{m-2}^* = U_{m+1}U_{m-1}^kU_{m-2}^* = U_{m+1}U_m^*. \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof.

(2) This follows immediately from (1) and $U_{n+2} = U_{n+1}^kU_n$ for $n \geq 2$. □

Corollary 4. *$\forall\ n \geq 2$, $\varepsilon_i = \varepsilon_{i+f_n}$, for $0 \leq i \leq f_{n+1} - 3$.*

Now we turn to introduce another numeration system (more details in [6]), based on the numbers defined in (2.1). We state the following theorem without proof.

Theorem 3. *Every integer $n \in \mathbb{N}$ can be uniquely expressed as $n = \sum_{i\geq 0} \tau_i(n)f_i$, with $\tau_i(n) \in \{0, 1, \cdots, k\}$, and if $\tau_{i+1}(n) = k$, then $\tau_i(n) = 0$, for all $i \geq 0$.*

The expression is called *regular expression* based on the integer sequence $(f_n)_{n\geq 0}$ defined in (2.1). Let $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$, j be a positive integer, we define

$$m \equiv_j n,$$

if $\tau_i(m) = \tau_i(n)$, for all $i < j$.

Lemma 2. *For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have*
(1) $\varepsilon_n = 0$ if and only if $\tau_0(n) \in \{0, 1, \cdots, k - 1\}$,
(2) $\varepsilon_n = 1$ if and only if $\tau_0(n) = k$.

Proof. It's only need to prove that $\varepsilon_n = 0$ if and only if $\tau_0(n) \in \{0, 1, \cdots, k-1\}$ by induction on n. The other statement has the same proof.

It is true for $n = 0, 1, \cdots, k$, since $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_0\varepsilon_1\varepsilon_2 \cdots = 0^k 1 \cdots$. Assume that it's true for $m < f_n$ for some $n \geq 1$, we need prove it's true for $f_n \leq m < f_{n+1} = kf_n + f_{n-1}$.

If $f_n \leq m < f_n + f_{n-1}$, then we have $m - f_n \leq f_{n-1}$. Let $m - f_n = \sum_{i=0}^{n-2} m_i f_i$ be a regular expression. Hence, $m = \sum_{i=0}^{n-2} m_i f_i + f_n$ is the regular expression of m. By Corollary 4, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_m = 0 \quad &\Leftrightarrow \quad \varepsilon_{m-f_n} = 0 \Leftrightarrow \tau_0(m - f_n) \in \{0, 1, \cdots, k-1\} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \quad m_0 \in \{0, 1, \cdots, k-1\} \Leftrightarrow \tau_0(m) \in \{0, 1, \cdots, k-1\}. \end{aligned}$$

Continue this process, the result is true for $tf_n + f_{n-1} \leq m < (t+1)f_n + f_{n-1} (t = 1, 2, \cdots, k-1)$, which ends the proof. □

Lemma 3. *Let $n = \Sigma_{i\geq 0} n_i f_i$ with $n_i \in \{0, 1, \cdots, k\}$, Assume that for $0 \leq i \leq t$ if $n_{i+1} = k$, then $n_i = 0$. Then we have $n_i = \tau_i(n)$ for $0 \leq i \leq t$.*

Proof. If there exists $i \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $n_{i+1} = k$, but $n_i \neq 0$. Let $i_0 = \max\{i \geq 0 : n_{i+1} = k, n_i \neq 0\}$. Let $j_0 = \max\{j \geq 0 : n_{i_0+1} = n_{i_0+3} = \cdots = n_j = k\}$. Clearly, $j_0 \geq i_0 + 1$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} n &= \sum_{i=0}^{i_0-1} n_i f_i + \sum_{i=i_0}^{j_0} n_i f_i + \sum_{i=j_0+1}^{\infty} n_i f_i \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{i_0-1} n_i f_i + (n_{i_0} - 1) f_{i_0} + (n_{j_0+1} + 1) f_{j_0+1} + \sum_{i=j_0+2}^{\infty} n_i f_i \\ &= \sum_{i\geq 0} n'_i f_i. \end{aligned}$$

The new expression is either regular or has a smaller maximum index i with $n_{i+1} = k$, but $n_i \neq 0$. and unchanged at the index less than t. By continuing this procedure, we finally get the regular expression of n, which does not change the original expression at the indices less than t. Hence, we have $n_i = \tau_i(n)$ for $0 \leq i \leq t$. □

Lemma 4. *$\forall\ i \in \mathbb{N}$, $n \geq 0$, $\varepsilon_{i+f_n} \neq \varepsilon_i$ if and only if $i \equiv_{n+1} f_{n+1} - 2$ or $i \equiv_{n+1} f_{n+1} - 1$. Moreover,*

$$\varepsilon_{i+f_n} - \varepsilon_i = \begin{cases} (-1)^n & \text{if } i \equiv_{n+1} f_{n+1} - 2, \\ (-1)^{n+1} & \text{if } i \equiv_{n+1} f_{n+1} - 1. \end{cases}$$

Proof. If $n = 0$, it is easy to check that it is true. Now we assume that $n \geq 1$. Hence there are two cases for discussion.

Case 1: $n \geq 1$, and $\tau_n(i) \neq k$. Then, we have

$$i + f_n = \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} \tau_j(i) f_j + (\tau_n(i) + 1) f_n + \sum_{j=n+1}^{\infty} \tau_j(i) f_j.$$

If $n \geq 2$, then $\tau_0(i + f_n) = \tau_0(i)$ by Lemma 3;
If $n = 1, 0 \leq \tau_n(i) \leq k - 2$, then $\tau_0(i + f_n) = \tau_0(i)$ by Lemma 3;
If $n = 1, \tau_n(i) = k - 1, \tau_0(i) = 0$, then $\tau_0(i + f_n) = \tau_0(i)$ by Lemma 3;

If $n=1, \tau_n(i)=k-1, \tau_0(i)\neq 0$, then we have

$$i+f_n=\tau_0(i)+kf_1+\sum_{j=2}^{\infty}\tau_j(i)f_j=(\tau_0(i)-1)+(\tau_2(i)+1)f_2+\sum_{j=3}^{\infty}\tau_j(i)f_j.$$

By Lemma 3, we have $\tau_0(i+f_n)=\tau_0(i)-1$. Hence, by Lemma 2, if $1\leq\tau_0(i)\leq k-1$, we have $\varepsilon_{i+f_n}=\varepsilon_i$; if $\tau_0(i)=k$, we have $\varepsilon_{i+f_n}\neq\varepsilon_i$.

Hence, in the case 1: $n\geq 1$, and $\tau_n(i)\neq k$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\varepsilon_{i+f_n}\neq\varepsilon_i &\Leftrightarrow n=1,\tau_0(i)=k,\tau_n(i)=k-1,\\ &\Leftrightarrow i\equiv_{n+1} f_{n+1}-2\ (n=1).\end{aligned}$$

Case 2: $n\geq 1$, and $\tau_n(i)=k$. Let $j=\min\{t\geq 0:\tau_n(i)=\tau_{n-2}(i)=\cdots=\tau_t(i)=k\}$. Clearly, $\tau_{j-2}(i)\leq k-1$. By the equation $(k+1)f_n=f_{n+1}+(k-1)f_{n-1}+f_{n-2}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}i+f_n &= \sum_{s=0}^{j-3}\tau_s(i)f_s+(\tau_{j-2}(i)+1)f_{j-2}+(k-1)f_{j-1}\\ &+ kf_{j+1}+\cdots+kf_{n-1}+(\tau_{n+1}(i)+1)f_{n+1}+\sum_{s=n+2}^{\infty}\tau_s(i)f_s.\end{aligned}$$

where the first term on the right-hand side vanishes if $j=0,1,2$. Hence

If $j\geq 4$, by Lemma 3, we have $\tau_0(i+f_n)=\tau_0(i)$;

If $j=3$, then $\tau_1(i)\leq k-1$ and $i+f_n=\tau_0(i)f_0+(\tau_1(i)+1)f_1+(k-1)f_2+kf_4+\cdots+kf_{n-1}+(\tau_{n+1}(i)+1)f_{n+1}+\sum_{s=n+2}^{\infty}\tau_s(i)f_s$. Hence there are following subcases;

If $\tau_0(i)=0$, by Lemma 3, we have $\tau_0(i+f_n)=\tau_0(i)$;

If $\tau_0(i)\neq 0, \tau_1(i)\leq k-2$, by Lemma 3, we have $\tau_0(i+f_n)=\tau_0(i)$;

If $\tau_0(i)\neq 0, \tau_1(i)=k-1$, hence if $\tau_0(i)=k$, then $\varepsilon_{i+f_n}\neq\varepsilon_i$, and if $\tau_0(i)\neq k$, then $\varepsilon_{i+f_n}=\varepsilon_i$.

If $j=2$, then $\tau_0(i)\leq k-1$ and $i+f_n=(\tau_0(i)+1)f_0+(k-1)f_1+kf_3+\cdots+kf_{n-1}+(\tau_{n+1}(i)+1)f_{n+1}+\sum_{s=n+2}^{\infty}\tau_s(i)f_s$. By Lemma 3, we have $\tau_0(i+f_n)=\tau_0(i)+1$. So if $\tau_0(i)=k-1$, then $\varepsilon_{i+f_n}\neq\varepsilon_i$;

If $j=1$, then $\tau_0(i)=0$ and $i+f_n=kf_0+kf_2+\cdots+kf_{n-1}+(\tau_{n+1}(i)+1)f_{n+1}+\sum_{s=n+2}^{\infty}\tau_s(i)f_s$. Hence $\tau_0(i+f_n)=k$, so we have $\varepsilon_{i+f_n}\neq\varepsilon_i$;

If $j=0$, then $\tau_0(i)=k$ and $i+f_n=kf_1+kf_3+\cdots+kf_{n-1}+(\tau_{n+1}(i)+1)f_{n+1}+\sum_{s=n+2}^{\infty}\tau_s(i)f_s$. Hence, $\varepsilon_{i+f_n}\neq\varepsilon_i$.

Combining all discussions of the second case, we obtain the first part.

The second part follows from Lemma 2 directly. □

3. Proofs of Theorem 1 and Proposition 1

To prove Theorem 1, we need following lemma. We state it as follow without proof.

Lemma 5 (Adamaczewski and Rivoal [4]). *Let $\xi,\alpha,\beta,\gamma\in\mathbb{R}$ and $\alpha\leq\beta$, $\gamma>1$. Assume that there exist positive real numbers $c_0,c_1\leq c_2$ and a sequence $(\frac{p_n}{q_n})_{n\geq 1}$ of rational numbers such that*

$$q_n<q_{n+1}\leq c_0q_n^{\gamma},(n\geq 1),$$

and

$$\frac{c_1}{q_n^{1+\beta}} \leq |\xi - \frac{p_n}{q_n}| \leq \frac{c_2}{q_n^{1+\alpha}}, (n \geq 1).$$

Then $\mu(\xi) \leq (1+\beta)\frac{\gamma}{\alpha}$.

Now, we are going to prove Theorem 1.

Proof of Theorem 1 For any integer $k \geq 1$, let $\varphi_k(z) = \sum_{i\geq 0} \varepsilon_i z^i$ be the generating function of the sequence ε. For any integer $n \geq 2$, define integer polynomials $P_n(z) = \varepsilon_0 + \varepsilon_1 z + \cdots + \varepsilon_{f_n-1} z^{f_n-1}$, $Q_n(z) = 1 - z^{f_n}$, then, by Corollary 4,

$$\begin{aligned} Q_n(z)\varphi_k(z) - P_n(z) &= \sum_{i\geq 0} (\varepsilon_{f_n+i} - \varepsilon_i) z^{f_n+i} \\ &= \sum_{i\geq f_{n+1}-2} (\varepsilon_{f_n+i} - \varepsilon_i) z^{f_n+i}. \end{aligned}$$

Set $\delta_n(z) := \varphi_k(z) - \frac{P_n(z)}{Q_n(z)}$, by Lemma 4, then

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_n(z) &= \frac{1}{1-z^{f_n}} \cdot z^{f_n+f_{n+1}-2}[(\varepsilon_{f_n+f_{n+1}-2} - \varepsilon_{f_{n+1}-2}) + (\varepsilon_{f_n+f_{n+1}-1} - \varepsilon_{f_{n+1}-1})z + \cdots] \\ &= \frac{1}{1-z^{f_n}} \cdot z^{f_n+f_{n+1}-2}[(-1)^n + (-1)^{n-1}z + (-1)^n z^{f_{n+1}} + (-1)^{n-1} z^{f_{n+1}+1} + \cdots] \\ &= \frac{1}{1-z^{f_n}} \cdot z^{f_n+f_{n+1}-2}[(-1)^n + (-1)^{n-1}z] \sum_{\substack{j\geq 0, \\ \tau_0(j)\neq k.}} z^{\sum_{i\geq 0}\tau_i(j) f_{n+1+i}}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $b \geq 2$ be an integer. Taking $z = \frac{1}{b}$, we have

$$\left|\delta_n(\frac{1}{b})\right| = \frac{b^{f_n}}{b^{f_n}-1} \cdot \frac{1}{b^{f_n+f_{n+1}-2}} \cdot \left|(-1)^n + (-1)^{n-1}\frac{1}{b}\right| \cdot \left| \sum_{\substack{j\geq 0, \\ \tau_0(j)\neq k}} b^{-\sum_{i\geq 0}\tau_i(j) f_{n+1+i}} \right|.$$

Hence,

$$\left|\delta_n(\frac{1}{b})\right| \leq \frac{b^{f_n}}{b^{f_n}-1} \cdot \frac{1}{b^{f_n+f_{n+1}-2}} \cdot (1-\frac{1}{b}) \sum_{i\geq 0} \frac{1}{b^i} = \frac{1}{b^{f_n}-1} \cdot \frac{1}{b^{f_{n+1}-2}}$$

and

$$\left|\delta_n(\frac{1}{b})\right| \geq \frac{b^{f_n}}{b^{f_n}-1} \cdot \frac{1}{b^{f_n+f_{n+1}-2}} \cdot (1-\frac{1}{b}) = \frac{1}{b^{f_n}-1} \cdot \frac{1}{b^{f_{n+1}-2}} \cdot \frac{b-1}{b}.$$

Thus, for any integer $b \geq 2$,

$$\frac{1}{b^{f_n}-1} \cdot \frac{1}{b^{f_{n+1}-2}} \cdot \frac{b-1}{b} \leq \left|\delta_n(\frac{1}{b})\right| \leq \frac{1}{b^{f_n}-1} \cdot \frac{1}{b^{f_{n+1}-2}}. \tag{3.1}$$

Define integers

$$p_n = b^{f_n} \cdot P_n(\frac{1}{b}) \in \mathbb{Z},$$

$$q_n = b^{f_n} \cdot Q_n(\frac{1}{b}) = b^{f_n} - 1 \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

By Formula (3.1), there exist positive numbers $c_0, c_1 \leq c_2$, depending only on b, such that

$$q_n < q_{n+1} \leq c_0 q_n^{\frac{f_{n+1}}{f_n}}, (n \geq 1), \tag{3.2}$$

and

$$\frac{c_1}{q_n^{1+\frac{f_{n+1}}{f_n}}} \leq |\varphi_k(\frac{1}{b}) - \frac{p_n}{q_n}| \leq \frac{c_2}{q_n^{1+\frac{f_{n+1}}{f_n}}}, (n \geq 1). \tag{3.3}$$

Let $\theta := \lim_{n\to\infty} \theta_n = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{f_{n+1}}{f_n} = \frac{k+\sqrt{k^2+4}}{2}$. Then for any real number $\epsilon \geq 0$, by Formula (3.2) and Formula (3.3), there exists a large number $n_0(\varepsilon)$, such that

$$q_n < q_{n+1} \leq c_0 q_n^{\theta+\epsilon}, (n \geq n_0(\epsilon));$$

and

$$\frac{c_1}{q_n^{\theta+\epsilon}} \leq |\varphi_k(\frac{1}{b}) - \frac{p_n}{q_n}| \leq \frac{c_2}{q_n^{\theta-\epsilon}}, (n \geq n_0(\epsilon)).$$

By Lemma 5, we have $\theta - \epsilon \leq \mu(\varphi_k(\frac{1}{b})) \leq (\theta+\epsilon)\frac{\theta+\epsilon}{\theta-\epsilon}$. Let $\epsilon \to 0$, we have $\mu(\varphi_k(\frac{1}{b})) = 1 + \theta$ for any integer $b \geq 2$, which completes this proof.

Then we are going to prove Proposition 1.

Proof of Proposition 1 Let $\mathbf{v} = \{v_i\}_{i\geq 0} = \mathbf{u} \times S(\mathbf{u}) = \{[u_i, u_{i+1}]\}_{i\geq 0}$. Note that the value of $[u_i, u_{i+1}]$ is determined by the block "$u_i u_{i+1}$", but there are exactly 3 blocks with length 2 in any Sturmian sequence. Without loss of generality, assume

$$\{u_i u_{i+1} : i \geq 0\} = \{01, 10, 11\}.$$

Then there exist $a_i \in \mathbb{Q}$ $(0 \leq i \leq 2)$ such that

$$[u_i, u_{i+1}] = a_0 u_i + a_1 u_{i+1} + a_2.$$

In fact, $a_0 = [1,1] - [0,1], a_1 = [1,1] - [1,0], a_2 = [0,1] + [1,0] - [1,1]$. Since $\mathbf{v}$ is non-eventually periodic, at least one of a_0, a_1 is not zero. Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\xi_{\mathbf{v},b} &= \sum_{i\geq 0} v_i \cdot \frac{1}{b^i} \\
&= \sum_{i\geq 0} (a_0 u_i + a_1 u_{i+1} + a_2) \cdot \frac{1}{b^i} \\
&= a_0 \sum_{i\geq 0} \frac{u_i}{b^i} + a_1 \sum_{i\geq 0} \frac{u_{i+1}}{b^i} + a_2 \frac{b}{b-1} \\
&= a_0 \xi_{\mathbf{u},b} + a_1 b(\xi_{\mathbf{u},b} - u_0) + a_2 \frac{b}{b-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

By the definition of irrationality exponent, we have, for any integer $b \geq 2$, $\mu(\xi_{\mathbf{u}\times S(\mathbf{u}),b}) = \mu(\xi_{\mathbf{u},b}) = a$, which completes this proof.

Proof of Corollary 2 By the definition of the difference operation, we see that for $k \geq 1$, $\Delta^k(\mathbf{u}) = \left(\sum_{i=0}^{k} \binom{k}{i} u(n+i)\right) \mod 2$. Hence, the value of $\Delta^k(\mathbf{u})$ is determined by the block "$u(n)u(n+1)\cdots u(n+k)$", and there are exactly $k+2$ blocks with length $k+1$ in any Sturmian sequence. Hence, by a same method of

Proposition 1, we have for any integer $k \geq 1$, $\mu(\xi_{\Delta^k(\mathbf{u}),b}) = \mu(\xi_{\mathbf{u},b}) = a$ for any integer $b \geq 2$.

Acknowledgements. The authors gratefully thank Professor Jeffrey Shallit for his helpful suggestions.

References

[1] Adamczewski B, Allouche J P, Reversals and plaindromes in continued fractions, Theoret. Comput. Sci. 2007, **380**: 220-237.

[2] Adamczewski B, Bugeaud Y, On the complexity of algebraic numbers,I.Expansions in integer bases, Ann. of Math. 2007, **165**(2): 547-565.

[3] Adamczewski B, Cassaigne J, Diophantine properties of real numbers generated by finite automata, Compos. Math. 2006, **142**: 1351-1372.

[4] Adamczewski B, Rivoal T, Irrationality measures for some automatic real numbers, Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. 2009, **147**: 659-678.

[5] Adams W W, Davison J L, A remarkable class of continued fractions, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 1977, **65**: 194-198.

[6] Allouche J P, Shallit J, Automatic Sequence, Theory, Applications, Generalizations, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003.

[7] Böhmer P E, Über die Transzendenz gewisser dyadischer Brüche, Math. Annalen. 1926, **96**: 367-377.

[8] Bugeaud Y, On the rational approximation of The Thue-Morse-Mahler numbers, Ann. Institut Fourier, 2011, **61**: 2065-2076.

[9] Bugeaud Y, Krieger D, Shallit J, Morphic and Automatic Words: Maximal Blocks and Diophantine Approximation, Acta Arith. 2011, **149**: 181-199.

[10] Bullett S, Sentenac P, Ordered orbits of the shift, square roots, and the devil's staircase, Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc. 1994, **115**: 451-481.

[11] Coons M, Vrbik P, An irrationality measure for regular paperfolding numbers, J. Integer Seq. 2012, **15**: 1-10.

[12] Coons M, On the rational approximation of the sum of the reciprocals of the Fermat numbers, Ramanujan J. 2013, **30**(1): 39-65.

[13] Danilov L V, Some classes of transcendental numbers, Mat. Zametki. 1972, **12**: 149-154.

[14] Davison J L, A series and its associated continued fraction, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 1977, **63**: 29-32.

[15] Guo Y J, Wen Z X, Wu W, On the irrationality exponent of the regular paperfolding numbers, Linear Algebra Appl. 2014, **446**: 237-264.

[16] Guo Y J, Wen Z X, Automaticity of the Hankel determinants of difference sequence of the Thue-Morse sequence and rational approximation, Theoret. Comput. Sci. 2014, **552**: 1-12.

[17] Shiu P, A function from Diophantine approximations, Publ. Inst. Math.(Beograd) 1999, **65**: 52-62.

[18] Tamura J I, Padé approximation for infinite words generated by certain substitutions, and Hankel determinants. In: Number Theory and Its Applications, K.Győry and S.Kanemitsu (eds.), Kluwer Academic Publishers. 1999: 309-346.

[19] Kamae T, Tamura J I, Wen Z Y, Hankel determinants for the Fibonacci word and Padé approximation, Acta Arith. 1999, **2**: 123-161.

[20] Wen Z X, Wen Z Y, Some studies of factors of infinite words generated by invertible substitution, A. Barlotti, M. Delest, R. Pinzani (Eds.), Proc. 5th Conf. Formal Power Series and Algebraic Combinatorics 1993: 455-466.

[21] Wen Z X, Wen Z Y, Some properties of the singular words of the Fibonacci word, European J. Combin. 1994, **15**: 587-598.

[22] Wen Z X, Wen Z Y, Wu J, Invertible substitutions and local isomorphisms, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math. 2002, **334**: 629-634.